



## 5-Year Man on Campus With Ellison Clary

### Let's Try To Clear Up Beer Ad Controversy

Just about everybody you meet on campus lately seems to want to discuss action taken by the Publication Board in regard to advertising policy of the three student publications at a recent meeting. Many of these people are at least partially uninformed, however, as to the details of what took place both at the meeting and after it.

Since I have been a member of the Pub Board from the time its conception last year and was in attendance at the controversial November 2 session, I'll use this column in an effort to calm the ripples of confusion.

The meeting of two Thursdays ago was intended to have been somewhat of a catch-all for publication business which had accumulated over a period of time. Such items as budget considerations, problems of remuneration, contracts, financial procedures report, monthly accounting, and constitution changes were listed on the agenda which each board member received before the meeting.

Discussion of advertising policy was not listed on the agenda, dated October 24, but it was made known to board members before the meeting that Dr. Bonnie Cone wished that this item be inserted into the business.

So the stage was set and after the lengthy meeting of the board reconvened from a dinner recess, discussion turned to advertising policy.

Dr. Cone related her distress in regard to two full-page beer advertisements which appeared in the 1967 edition of the year-book and to the small, four-column-inch beer advertisement seen in the October 25 edition of the Carolina Journal. In both cases these advertisements were the first of their kind to be printed in a publication on this campus.

Dr. Cone is a voting member of the Pub Board and frequently sits in on portions of its meetings, told board members she feared unfavorable reactions to the beer advertisements from certain Founding Patrons and trustees. She said such reactions might well be harmful to the university here in its formative stages.

After a discussion of more than 30 minutes, Pub Board Chairman Dr. Darryl McCall sensed a general consensus of the members, both voting and non-voting, to revert to what Dr. Cone called a "gentleman's agreement" to exclude advertisements for beer and hard liquor in campus publications. Dr. Cone seemed to feel this agreement had been in effect all along, although publication editors, both past and present, were unaware of its existence.

No vote was taken on the issue. The members simply agreed to make an effort to carry on without ads of this type until such time as they wished to bring up the issue before the board again.

This discussion being finished, it was agreed to adjourn the board meeting until Thursday, November 16.

### Begin To Reevaluate

By the weekend, certain members of the board had begun to re-evaluate their feelings in regard to the beer ad issue. Michael Carmichael, newly elected student body representative to the board told me that Sunday, November 5, of his misgivings.

Carmichael, after discussing the matter with faculty members and students, began to fear that the board had seriously limited freedom of the press in arriving at its "gentleman's agreement." He felt this decision was in reality, an act of censorship and that it should be reversed.

By last Tuesday, Carmichael started circulating copies of a petition for students and faculty members to sign. The petition read as follows:

"We, the undersigned, respectfully protest the limitations placed by the Publication Board on beer and liquor advertisements in student publications and request that the decisions on whether to accept such advertisements be left to the editorial staff of the publications involved."

The petitions were eagerly signed by students and faculty members. The 25 signature spaces on the first copy of the petition filled in five minutes.

In the meantime, faculty members Dr. John Robbins and Dr. Dan Morrill penned letters to the editor to back up signers of the petition. The letters appear elsewhere on the editorial pages.

Last Friday morning, a new development was brought out by a story in the Charlotte Observer. Publicity Director Ken Sanford was quoted as saying that no other branch of the university accepts beer or hard liquor ads for its publications.

The story pointed out that this statement is erroneous, since The Daily Tar Heel at Chapel Hill does accept ads of this type.

Sanford agreed Friday morning that the Tar Heel does indeed accept the ads but he said this acceptance may be a breach of university policy.

### It Will Be Interesting

Sanford said it will be interesting to see what will happen when the more than one thousand signatures which Carmichael hopes to have on the petition by tomorrow are presented to the board at its scheduled meeting.

"It may well be that the board will ask Chancellor Colvard for a decision on the matter," said Sanford.

He added this decision, no matter what it is or who makes it, could possibly set a precedent for all branches of the university.

### Letter To The Editor

## Legitimate Concern For Public Wants Carried To Extreme Here

Editor  
Carolina Journal

Dear Editor:  
The moment has arrived when I must speak out against what in my opinion endangers the fundamental integrity of this institution - the tendency of certain administrators and unfortunately even faculty members and students to concern themselves to an inordinate degree with the image of UNC-C among key power blocs within the Charlotte community. In no way do I question the good intentions of this faction on our campus. I am fully aware that the leadership of the institution must be sensitive to the needs, aspirations, and desires of the public. But it is my contention that this legitimate concern has been car-

ried to an unjustifiable extreme and is therefore eroding the very foundations of a legitimate university - the ability to speak out freely but always in good taste on the critical issues facing our society.

On November 2 the publications board of UNC-C agreed that no beer or hard liquor advertising shall appear hereafter in any campus publication. Certainly, the issue of beer advertising, even though indicative of a somewhat trivial sense of values is not important in itself. Its significance results from the fact that it stems from a much deeper illness.

To diagnose the disease, I

must first list the symptoms, spell out specifically the arguments advanced to justify this action. Apparently foremost on the list of justification was the contention that UNC-C has an obligation to its trustees and patrons to communicate the highest ideals to its students. First of all, that the appearance of beer advertising in a campus publication would in any way violate this pledge somehow escapes my own limited abilities of comprehension. But even if this particular form of advertising does violate the standards of good taste, its exclusion might well serve as a precedent for the broad extension of censorship. Should restaurants serving beer be allowed to purchase space in a campus publication? Should UNC-C students be permitted to read Lenin's Collected Works in the Library? The insidious cycle could run on and on.

Apparently another argument persuading some members of the publications board to support the recent action of that body was the belief that the appearance of beer or hard liquor advertising would lessen the chances of the year-book to be judged highly by some national board of editors.

board of editors. As hopefully made clear above, I content that the recent action of the publications board is essentially a violation of principle. Far better, therefore, to have a year-book untainted by this ridiculous and unjustifiable application of censorship than to sell our campus soul for a bowl of porridge in the name of a blue ribbon.

What is the disease present on our campus? It is a misfortunate misunderstanding of the essential purpose of higher education. It would seem that there are individuals on this campus who regard themselves as the protectors of the collective virtue of the students. With pail in hand, they enter the greenhouse, careful to allow only the correct fertilizers to touch the tender young minds around them. Attention students! Descending upon our campus is a blanket of insulting paternalism.

Dr. Dan L. Morrill  
Assistant Professor  
Department of History.

## Reporter Accepts Advice

Dear Editor:

I would like to thank Dave Herman for his letter concerning the Green Garter in the November 8 issue of the Carolina Journal. Even though I did write the article blasting UNC-C Students, I agree with Mr. Herman's ideas. He is right in saying that the reporter's first thought was against the students who didn't attend the function. I admit that it never occurred to me to write an article suggesting positive ideas to the students who provided the Green Garter.

The coffee house may have been more successful had the publicity been more extensive. The ticket selling idea is good; however, it may not have worked in this case due to reservations that were made. Still it is up to the students to decide whether coffee houses will continue.

A good reporter should examine both sides of a story. Thank you, Mr. Herman for indirectly calling this fact to my attention. In the future I will examine both sides of a question before I report an issue.  
Sonia Mizell

## Spirit Of Paternalism Must Be Dispelled

Editor  
The Carolina Journal  
University of N.C. at Charlotte  
Charlotte, North Carolina

Dear Editor:

A University is--or should be--a place where honest difference of opinion can be aired and discussed. It is in this spirit that I feel I must speak out concerning the November 2 decision of the Publications Board to ban--or limit--beer and hard liquor advertisements in the student publications at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte. This I sincerely believe is an unfortunate precedent and is symptomatic of a far more serious problem at this would-be university.

Permit me to turn my attention first to the issue of banning beer and liquor advertisement in student publications. The plausible reasons advanced for such action run as follows: they are in poor taste, only second rate publications accept such advertisement and they somehow harm the rating of a publication by some national board of editors. None of these reasons seems sufficient to me to open what could become a Pandora's box of censorship. With censorship of advertising policy as a start, will editorial policy be next? If you think my alarm is an ungrounded fear or an argument ad absurdum, consider this: an argument advanced to support the ban on beer advertisement is based on a "journalistic canon of good taste" which bans advertisements for products of women's hygiene and beer! It does not seem absurd to me then to fear editorial censorship from a group which can somehow equate advertisements for feminine hygiene and beer. Labeling beer and liquor advertisements "bad taste" seems to me to reflect more on the people making the charge than on the University or the publications accepting the advertisement. If we cannot challenge here the long-held narrow-minded views of fundamentalists who have smothered progress in the South, there seems to be little hope that UNC-C will ever attain university status. Furthermore, if only second-rate publications accept such advertisement, this places the New York Times in such a classification. If the New York Times is second

rate, I eagerly await second rate status for UNC-C publications.

I suggest that the decision on whether or not to accept beer advertisements be left to the publication involved. This would then enable the editor to decide for himself whether to accept the tainted money of beer and liquor advertisers and thereby risk national rating for his publication. This seems to me to be a much sounder policy than for the Publications Board to make what will undoubtedly become a binding precedent.

This problem however goes far beyond the mere issue of beer advertisements in student publications. It appears as yet another step in the creation of an atmosphere designed to shield and protect the student - the well-known attitude of paternalism which pervades this campus. Above all it appears as still another attempt to maintain an atmosphere which will not upset the Charlotte community and The Patrons. The end result is an atmosphere which stifles student freedoms--from dress to expressions. It is an atmosphere which brings the BWOC blanket concert indoors lest we lost control of the students or offend the Charlotte community. It is an atmosphere which initiates a ban on beer advertisements so we won't offend the community. It is an atmosphere in which we are constantly described as a "service institution." It is an atmosphere in which the University too often follows rather than leads the Charlotte community. It is an atmosphere designed to nip

in the bud any attempt to build a truly significant university in the Piedmont Carolinas.

Beer advertisement is not the really important issue here. It is merely, the tangible example of a pervading atmosphere which must be examined, challenged and somehow overcome before we can achieve a university or academic environment.

Faculty and students together should challenge this atmosphere and take concrete action necessary to establish a true university atmosphere at UNC-C. We have waited and delayed too long. The time to act is now.

Sincerely,  
John B. Robbins  
Assistant Professor  
Department of History.

## Double Standard Unfair

Dear Editor:

Several times when I have gone to the Parquet Room for a lecture or a dance the announcer asked everyone not to smoke. The reason he gave was that we have a nice floor and we want to keep it that way.

Thursday night after a Pied-

mont Crescent assembly I went into the Parquet Room and found black smudges all over the floor in the back of the room.

Why are visitors to our school allowed to disobey rules that we must follow? A double standards system is unfair.  
Frank Sassar.